Dilution Effects on Ordering in the $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg Antiferromagnet on the Square Lattice

J. Behre
Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Hannover, Appelstr. 2, 3000 Hannover 1, Germany
email (internet): behre@kastor.itp.uni-hannover.de

S. Miyashita
Graduate School of Human & Environmental Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan
email (Bitnet): miya@JPNYITP
(February 1, 2008)

arXiv:cond-mat/9305004v1 10 May 1993

The influence of dilution with non–magnetic impurities on the order in the ground state of the $S = 1/2$ Heisenberg antiferromagnet is investigated by Quantum Monte Carlo simulations. Data of the spin correlation functions and thermodynamic properties for system sizes up to $L \times L = 16 \times 16$ and for impurity concentrations up to $\delta = 37.5\%$ are presented. In the low doping regime the correlation length shows similiar dependence on temperature as in the pure case. The staggered magnetization $\langle N_z^2(\delta)\rangle$ in the ground state which is the order parameter of the present model is estimated by extrapolating data at low temperatures. Impurity concentration dependence of $\langle N_z^2(\delta)\rangle$ is presented. $\langle N_z^2(\delta)\rangle$ decreases monotonically with impurity concentration and becomes very small around $\delta_c \sim 0.35$ which is much smaller than the classical percolation threshold.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Jm, 75.30.Kz

I. INTRODUCTION

In this article we show new results on the spin correlation functions and the long range order of the diluted Heisenberg antiferromagnet on the square lattice with $S = 1/2$. Originally this work was intended to understand the effects created upon doping of the high temperature superconductor materials. It is now generally believed that the pure antiferromagnet with $S = 1/2$ on the square lattice has long range order[1,2]. But the value of the order parameter is much reduced against its classical value due to quantum fluctuations. The interesting point now is the influence of inhomogeneities on the competition between order and quantum fluctuations.

For our purpose it is necessary to study large lattices and these systems are too large to use exact diagonalization. Therefore we used the Quantum Monte Carlo method (QMC). Because we are working only with static impurities, the minus sign problem does not suffer the present QMC. And our results might be applicable to experiments with materials like $La_2Cu_{1-\delta}Mg_\delta O_4$ and $La_2Cu_{1-\delta}Zn_\delta O_4$[3]. In these materials magnetic copper atoms are substituted by non–magnetic zinc or magnesium atoms, so there are static non–magnetic site impurities, which are the same type of impurities we are considering in our simulations.

In the present paper we report the temperature and impurity concentration dependence of the spin correlation functions and also the long range order in the ground state.

We have studied the spin correlation functions for various concentrations in a wide temperature region including lower temperatures than the previous Manousakis' work[4]. We analyze the concentration dependence of the correlation length in the form

$$\xi(T,\delta) = C_\xi(\delta) e^{\frac{2\pi\rho_S(\delta)}{T}} \ . \tag{1}$$

The correlation data fit this behavior well. And the estimated spin stiffness $\rho_S(\delta)$ is monotonically decreasing with impurity concentration.

In the classical analog of the model, the long range order exists as long as the lattice itself percolates. Namely, the long range order vanishes at an impurity concentration corresponding to the percolation threshold, $\delta_c = 0.41$[5]. In the present paper, the impurity concentration dependence of the long range order is reported. We would like to point out that the amount of the long range order becomes very small for $\delta \sim 0.35$, which is much smaller than $\delta_c = 0.41$. The concentration dependence of percolating lattice sites has a dependence $(\delta - \delta_c)^\beta$ with $\beta < 1$ and therefore it has a convex shape. On the other hand, the obtained dependence of the long range order for the present model has a concave shape. Furthermore, it is suggested that the critical value of the concentration is also reduced in the quantum case.

Our method is described in chapter II. The results for the spin–spin correlation functions are shown in chapter III and those for the long range order in chapter IV. The results are summarized and discussed in chapter V.

II. METHOD

The model including the inhomogeneities used here can be described by the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = J \sum_{<i,j>} \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_j \ , \tag{2}$$

where $\varepsilon_i = 0$ for holes otherwise $\varepsilon_i = 1$ (for spins), $\vec{S}_i$ are the $S = 1/2$ spin operators ($\vec{S}_i = \frac{1}{2}\vec{\sigma}_i$), and the sum runs over nearest neighbour pairs i and j, J is the antiferromagnetic coupling constant. The positions of the holes were chosen randomly but fixed for one simulation, so they are static non–magnetic impurities. The concentration of impurities is defined by δ,

$$\delta = 1 - \sum_i \varepsilon_i / L^2 \ , \tag{3}$$

where L is the linear system size of the square lattice and $N = L \times L$ is the number of lattice sites.

For the simulation we used the Quantum Monte Carlo method based on the Suzuki–Trotter formula and checker board decomposition[6,7,1]. Periodic boundary conditions were applied to the x–, y– and Trotter directions. In addition to standard local flip types we used special flip types in the neighbourhood of the impurities, local loop flips around small clusters of holes or single holes and non straight global flips in the x–y plane. Details of these new flip types are described in[8]. These new flip types are necessary for the ergodicity of the algorithm.

We study system sizes $L \times L$ with $L = 4, 8, 12, 16$ for impurity concentrations up to $\delta = 37.5\%$ corresponding to $6, 24, 36, 96$ holes. We perform simulations at various temperatures. The lowest one is $T = 0.05J$. For this low temperature it is necessary to go up to $9 \cdot 10^5$ Monte Carlo steps and Trotter numbers $m = 32$. We perform simulations for each sample with 3 or 4 different Trotter numbers m and then extrapolate for m to infinity by using a linear function in $(\frac{1}{m^2})$. An extrapolation up to quadratic order is used as a test for the error of the extrapolation. From these data the ground state properties are obtained by extrapolations.

The data for $L = 4$ are available from exact diagonalization. From these data we estimate the low temperature properties by summing up several low lying levels with the canonical weight. They are in good agreement with the data obtained by QMC. Larger systems are simulated by QMC. For each system size and hole concentration we average the data over five different samples with hole positions chosen randomly. Between them we found only small variation. Averaging over more than five samples is too much computer time consuming.

To study such a big parameter regime it is necessary to make an optimized and fully vectorized program. Locations of the new type flips for a given hole configuration are listed up and stored before the simulation. All transition probabilities for each fliptype, which are given by ratios of Boltzmann factors between possible local spin configurations, are also stored in tables in the beginning of the run. During the simulation the computer only has to compare the transition probability for a flip with a random number. If the flip is accepted, the configuration is replaced by the flipped configuration which is also stored in another table.

After one sweep, namely after each flip type is tested over the whole lattice, physical quantities are calculated. The data of 10000 sweeps are combined to one bin. The samples for each bin seem to be statistically independent with Gaussian distribution, so they can be used to calculate statistical errors. These data are extrapolated for m to infinity as mentioned above and then averaged over different configurations with the same system size and hole concentration. Averaging and extrapolation is done using a weighting procedure, each data point is weighted by the reciprocal of the square of its error. Final error bars are estimated only by this procedure. The further treatment of the correlation data are described in chapter III and the sublattice magnetization in chapter IV.

III. CONCENTRATION DEPENDENCE OF THE SPIN CORRELATION FUNCTIONS

One interesting property of the system is how the spin correlation function depends on the distance between two spins

$$c(r) = (-1)^r \frac{4}{L^2} \sum_i \langle S_i^z S_{i+r}^z \rangle \ , \tag{4}$$

where we only change the positions along the x– or y–direction.

In Fig. (1) the spin correlation functions for the system size $L = 16$ and temperature $T = 0.1J$ is shown for different hole concentrations. The correlation functions decrease with distance, although the data are symmetric at $r = 8$ because of the periodic boundary conditions. They also monotonically decrease with hole concentration for each distance. In references[9,10,8] the enhancements of short range correlation function near impurities are reported. But in the normalization of Eq. (4) the enhancements by nearest neighbour correlations near impurities are compensated by decreasement of the number of pairs of spins.

In order to study the temperature dependence of the correlation length, we have to fit our data to the expected correlation function. There is no agreement in the literature about the right form of this function as can be seen in the discussion of[11]. Ding and Makivić[12] used the form

$$c(r) = Ar^{-\lambda}e^{-\frac{r}{\xi}} \ , \tag{5}$$

where they used both of A and λ as the fitting parameters and found $\lambda \approx 0.4$. However spin wave calculations[13] and the Schwinger boson method[14] give $\lambda = 1$, the renormalization group approach[2] gives $\lambda = 0.5$ and some other authors[15,16,4] do not use the algebraic decaying part corresponding to $\lambda = 0$.

If we generalize the temperature dependence of the correlation length proposed by Chakravarty et. al.[2] to the case with impurities, we have[4]

$$\xi(T,\delta) = C_\xi(\delta)e^{\frac{2\pi\rho_S(\delta)}{T}} \ . \tag{6}$$

The prefactor C_ξ and the spin stiffness ρ_S now depend on the hole concentration δ and we want to test the validity of the form and specify the parameter regime where the form is valid.

We tried the least square fits of the data of the correlation function to the form Eq. (5) with different values of λ. In Fig. (1) the fitting curves using $\lambda = 1/2$ are shown. The fits look excellent and the errors for the fitted correlation lengths are very small (if we exclude the nearest neighbour spin pairs for the fit). If we use $\lambda = 1$ we get nearly the same results if the fitted correlation length is smaller than the system size. We find no significant difference for these two values of λ. But if we put $\lambda = 0$ we find bigger deviations of the fitting functions from the data points, and the fitting errors are much enhanced. In our analysis, there are too small number of data points to use λ also as a fitting parameter. If we would use the two parameters, λ and ξ, as the fitting parameter, λ varies largely to fit the shapes. In particular, for the cases where we found a long correlation length by using a fixed value of λ, the two parameter fitting concludes an algebraic decay without exponential part, namely $\lambda \neq 0$ and $\xi \simeq 0$.

So we estimated the correlation lengths by fitting using $\lambda = 1/2$. Their logarithmic values are plotted in Fig. (2) over $1/T$ for the different hole concentrations. Only the correlation lengths which are smaller than the system size are plotted. For these data the size dependence is small. Data appear in straight lines in this graph. Thus the temperature dependence is consistence with Eq. (6) and we can estimate the spin stiffness ρ_S from the slopes. In this graph error bars are not drawn because some of them are overlapping and they are rather confusing for the eye. For temperatures higher than $T = 0.5J$ the error bars are nearly like the point size. At $T = 0.25J$, the error bars for low concentrations, where the correlation length becomes comparable to the system size, increase up to 10%. In the estimation of ρ_S, this fact is taken into account by using a weighted fitting procedure. The fits are acceptable, but for high concentrations other fit functions cannot be excluded.

The concentration dependence of the spin stiffness is given in Fig. (3) and the estimated prefactor $C_\xi(\delta)$ in Fig. (4). For the pure system ($\delta = 0$) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_S &= 0.1734 \pm 0.0003J \\ C_\xi &= 0.393 \pm 0.008 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The shown errors are those which come only from our weighted fitting procedure and are definitely too small. The values are in the range of other authors as discussed in[11]. The prefactor slightly increases with concentration up to $\delta = 0.25$. The spin stiffness decreases by more than a factor of two in this regime and saturates afterwards. This behavior does not agree with the scaling properties proposed by Manousakis[4], who used a smaller parameter regime.

Recently Yanagisawa[17] has predicted making use of the non–linearσ–model with impurities that the exponential dependence on the temperature Eq. (6) changes to a linear dependence $1/T$ at a very small impurity concentration and that ξ is a temperature independent constant for δ larger than some critical concentration δ_c where the system is not ordered. The present data do not quantitatively agree with the work although we cannot rule out a transition to the linear dependence.

IV. CONCENTRATION DEPENDENCE OF THE LONG RANGE ORDER

In this chapter the data for the long range order in the ground state are studied. The order parameter of the system is the sublattice magnetization

$$\langle N_z^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{N^2} \left\langle \left(\sum_{i \epsilon \mathcal{A}} \sigma_i^z - \sum_{j \epsilon \mathcal{B}} \sigma_j^z \right)^2 \right\rangle , \tag{8}$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ denote the two different sublattices. In Fig. (5a) the sublattice magnetization is plotted against the temperature for different hole concentrations and for the system size $L = 8$. Fig. (5b) shows the data for $L = 12$ and Fig. (5c) for $L = 16$. For $L = 8$ there is no big variation for the low temperatures and the extrapolation to $T = 0$ is smooth, which means that the system is near the ground state at the low temperatures. But for $L = 12$ and $L = 16$ the errorbars are enlarged at low temperatures, although we could estimate a general tendency of the concentration dependence. In order to obtain these data, up to $9 \cdot 10^5$ MCS have been performed for lattices with several Trotter numbers. Still the errorbars are rather large. This shows the general difficulty to obtain low temperature data with QMC.

We regard the data at the lowest temperature as the ones in the ground state and extrapolate these data to the thermodynamic limit, namely L to infinity. The extrapolation is done using a polynomial in $1/L$. This is the same extrapolation scheme as in[1], where it is assumed that the spin correlation function decays by a power law $c(r) \sim \frac{1}{r}$ as is indicated by the spin wave theory. In Fig. (6) the data are plotted against $1/L$ for some concentrations. The size dependences are smoothly extrapolated as well as the pure case. Two different extrapolations are shown, a linear one and one with a polynomial up to the quadratic order. The extrapolated value for $\delta = 0.375$ is less than zero. That means the extrapolation scheme is no longer applicable here and the order parameter would already vanish.

To compare our sublattice magnetization with the spontaneous magnetization $m^\dagger = \langle S_i^z \rangle$ calculated in the spin wave theory, one has to consider the rotational invariance in spin space and the difference between S and σ. In the pure case ($\delta = 0$) we find

$$m^\dagger = \sqrt{\frac{3}{4} \langle N_z^2 \rangle} = 0.315 \pm 0.04 . \tag{9}$$

There are many results of this quantity as are seen in review articles[11,18], e. g. Anderson[19] found in spin wave calculations $m^\dagger = 0.303$ and Reger and Young[1] found $m^\dagger = 0.30 \pm 0.02$ with QMC. Our result is a little bit higher.

In Fig. (7), the linear extrapolated data and the data at $T = 0.1$ for various sizes are plotted against the concentration. The concentration dependences for each size are nearly described by a straight line. This suggests that there is only a small cooperative effect of the holes for the global order. The local effect found in[8] seems to be averaged out. The error bars are large in the middle concentration regime. The deviation of data in different samples is also large here. This observation implies that the order parameter depends more on the special arrangement of the holes for these concentrations. Here we see the extrapolated long rage order decreases with the concentration. It should be noted that the concentration dependence has a concave shape in contrast to a convex shape of the concentration dependence of the number of the percolating cluster which is equivalent to the long range order in the classical model. This suggests that quantum fluctuations have a stronger effect at higher concentrations. In the theory of the non–linear–σ model, it is suggested that there is a critical value for the quantum fluctuations. If the system has smaller quantum fluctuations than the critical value, the quantum fluctuations are irrelevant and the classical picture of ordering is realized. For example, the pure case belongs to this case and also cases with low concentrations obviously belong to this case. If the concentration becomes large, however, quantum fluctuations might exceed the critical value. Then the system shows a kind of a quantum disordered state where the long range order disappears although the lattice itself percolates. This critical value may correspond to δ_c in the reference[17] and then his conclusion qualitatively agree with the present results.

Although the fluctuation is rather large for definite conclusion, we would estimate the lowest concentration where the order parameter becomes zero in Fig. (7). We interpolate the data points and find roughly

$$\delta_c = 0.345 \pm 0.015 . \tag{10}$$

The error is only interpolated from the errorbars of the extrapolated data points and might be too small. In order to obtain a better value of the critical concentration, it is necessary to simulate larger systems at lower temperatures near our critical concentration and to average over more different hole configurations. But at present this would exceed the ability of standard computers. However the above estimation implies that the critical concentration is lower than the classical percolation threshold $\delta_c = 0.41$[5]. This point should be studied more in the future.

There are only very few studies on the doped case. Pimentel and Orbach[20] find in spin wave calculations to the t–J model $\delta_c = 0.32$, which they interpret as an upper bound for the sublattice magnetization. But the order in their model is destroyed by the mobility of the impurities.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We have extended the usual QMC algorithm to treat inhomogeneities in a lattice. Our new flip types enabled us to simulate diluted Heisenberg antiferromagnets on the square lattice. Results on the correlation length and the long range order have been presented.

From the spin correlation function, temperature and concentration dependences of the correlation lengths are investigated. The correlation lengths show an exponential dependence on $1/T$ over a wide concentration regime. The spin stiffness decreases more than 50% when the impurity concentration increases from zero to 0.25. It saturates around $\delta = 0.25$ and it seems to stay finite even at concentrations where the sublattice magnetization vanishes. But data for high concentrations have a rather large deviation and we do not exclude that the temperature dependence of the correlation length changes from the exponential form to a linear form at high concentrations.

The sublattice magnetization at $T = 0$ is estimated by extrapolation of data with finite L to infinity. For the pure case we get the same results of other authors. The sublattice magnetization of doped systems shows a similar size dependence as the pure case. We find a monotonic decrease of the order parameter with hole concentration. From the global shape of the concentration dependence, we conclude that the quantum fluctuations have a stronger effect at the high concentration region. Although the error bar is large, the critical concentration where the system becomes disordered is estimated as $\delta_c = 0.345$. This value is smaller than the classical percolation threshold. It is suggested that quantum fluctuation causes a quantum disordered state in the ground state.

It is difficult to compare directly the present data with the experimental data for doped La_2CuO_4 because of the following two reasons. First, in the two-dimensional Heisenberg model the Mermin–Wagner theorem[21] forbids breaking of a continuous symmetry in two–dimensional models at finite temperatures, while in the materials there is a small interplane coupling which creates a non zero Néel–temperature. Second, in the materials, doping creates mobile holes which cause different effects from the static holes. But recently Cheong et. al.[3] investigated $La_2Cu_{1-\delta}Mg_\delta O_4$ and $La_2Cu_{1-\delta}Zn_\delta O_4$, where doping leads to non–magnetic static impurities, which is closer to the present model although they are still itinerant systems. They find that the Néel–temperature goes to zero for a concentration $\delta_c = 0.22$ and that the critical concentration is clearly different from materials which can be described by a model with $S = 5/2$ or by an Ising–model. So there is also a hint for a reduction of the classical percolation threshold from experiments.

We hope that the concentration dependence of the long range order which is presented in this paper is found experimentally in some real materials and furthermore that the problem, whether the δ_c and the percolation threshold is different or not, is solved in future. This seems difficult for numerical methods at the present situation. We also hope for the appearance of very high performance special computers which may solve the problem.

The authors would like to thank Professor Mikeska for his continuous encouragement. The numerical simulations for the present study was very extensive. We spent more than 1500 CPU–hours on the FUJITSU S400/40 (5 Gflops peak performance) of the Regionales Rechenzentrum Niedersachsen and several thousand hours on IBM RS6000 workstations. The present study has been partially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for scientific Research on Priority Area from Ministry of Education, Science and Culture of Japan.

---

[1] J. D. Reger and A. P. Young, *Phys. Rev.* B **37**, 5978 (1988).
[2] S. Chakravarty, B. I. Halperin and D. R. Nelson, *Phys. Rev.* B **39**, 2344 (1989).
[3] S.–W. Cheong, A. S. Cooper, L. W. Rupp, B. Batlogg, J. D. Thompson and Z. Fisk, *Phys. Rev.* B **44**, 9739 (1991).
[4] E. Manousakis, *Phys. Rev.* B **45**, 7570 (1992).
[5] J. W. Essam, *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena* vol 2, Ed. C. Domb and M. S. Green (Academic, 1972) p. 197.
[6] M. Suzuki, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **51**, 183 and 1454 (1976).
[7] S. Miyashita, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **57**, 1934 (1988).
[8] J. Behre and S. Miyashita, *J. Phys.* A: Math. Gen. **25**, 4745 (1992).
[9] J. Behre, S. Miyashita and H.–J. Mikeska, *J. of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials* **104-107**, 863 (1992).

[10] S. Miyashita and J. Behre, in *Computational Approaches in Condensed Matter Physics*, Springer Proceedings in Physics **70**, ed. by S. Miyashita, M. Imada and H. Takayama, (Springer, Berlin, 1992) p. 145.
[11] T. Barnes, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* C **2**, 659 (1991).
[12] H. Q. Ding and M. S. Makivić, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64**, 1449 (1990).
[13] M. Takahashi, *Phys. Rev.* B. **40**, 2494 (1989).
[14] D. P. Arovas and A. Auerbach, *Phys. Rev.* **38**, 316 (1988).
[15] G. Gomez–Santos, J. D. Joannopoulos and J. W. Negele, *Phys. Rev.* B **39**, 4435 (1989).
[16] E. Manousakis and R. Salvador, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 840 (1988).
[17] T. Yanagisawa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 1026 (1992).
[18] E. Manousakis, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **63**, 1 (1991).
[19] P. W. Anderson, *Phys. Rev.* **86**, 694 (1952).
[20] I. R. Pimentel and R. Orbach, *Phys. Rev.*B **46**, 2920 (1992).
[21] N. D. Mermin and H. Wagner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **22**, 1133 (1966).

FIG. 1. The concentration dependence of the correlation function at $T = 0.1$.

FIG. 2. The temperature dependence of the correlation length.

FIG. 3. The concentration dependence of the correlation parameter ρ_S.

FIG. 4. The concentration dependence of the correlation parameter C_ξ.

FIG. 5. Temperature-dependence of $\langle N_z^2 \rangle$ for (a) $L = 8$ (b) $L = 12$ and (c) $L = 16$.

FIG. 6. Size dependences of $\langle N_z^2 \rangle$

FIG. 7. Concentration-dependence of $\langle N_z^2 \rangle$ for different system sizes and extrapolated values.